



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

57
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/881,464

06/14/2001

James L. Knighten

9793

7522

26890

7590

09/21/2004

JAMES M. STOVER

NCR CORPORATION

1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4

DAYTON, OH 45479

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/881,464	Applicant(s) KNIGHTEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Neil Abrams	Art Unit 2839	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-21-2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application. 1, 3-21, 24, 27-30, 32-47
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 1, 3-7, 9-11, 33, 34, 42-45
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected. 8, 12-21, 24, 27-30, 32, 35-41
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 19
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claims 12, 13, 16-18, 20, 21, 24, 27-30, 32, 35-41, 46, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingstone in view of Yoshimura and Blonder.

Livingston assembly includes housing 24, 18 that mate with a chassis port 3a (through fixture 32), a cover (shield) 8, attachment mechanism 12 and a cable engagement body (neck) 9, 10. Obvious to form shield part (neck) 10 to "surround" the cable shield 7 and to be joined thereto by piercing means in view of Blonder or by clamp means in view of Yoshimura or to omit shield 7 and to join neck 10 to shield 5 by piercing means.

Argument are not persuasive. The portion 10, is seen to directly engage the cable shield. Obvious to form neck 10 of outer shield 8 to surround and directly or piercingly engage the cable shield 7. This would ^{enable}~~engage~~ omission of ferrule 11. Reference in arguments to layer 6 does not avoid rejection.

The piercing means would pass through such layer. Also note that recited shield could be read on the two cable shields ^{and 7} 5. Claims 12 does not require both housing and shroud to be connected to the same tubular shield" as seems to be argued therefor is readable on reference use of two cable shields. Further obvious to use single cable shield as noted above.

Claims 24, 29, 30, 32, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandler in view of Van Doorn.

See discussion in last office action. As to arguments sine the shroud 42 closely surrounds the cable shield it is inherent that some capacitive coupling could exist. This

is basically the same arrangement as applicants arrangement that uses capacitive coupling.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment and pertinent to above rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See above discussions. As to page 15, lines 16-30, shell 8 is seen to be used to provide electrical path between cable shield 7 and the chassis through nut 12. No other purpose is apparent. Also see col. 2, lines 45-50. The zinc coating if present could be removed as necessary. For Van Doorn,, note fig.. 1B sheath 42 that closely surrounds the cable 14 for a considerable extend. Obvious that capacitive coupling could readily occur just as in applicant's device.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Claims 1, 8 are found allowable for reasons stated in Remarks. In addition claims 1, 8, when reads in their overall context and in light of arguments are seen to require a connector to be "connected to a chassis port" in a basically direct manner as in applicants fig. 3 at 132, 109 and to be covered by a "separate" shield". Yoshimura, Livingston Kuo, taken alone or together do not teach or suggest such a system.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claims 1, 3-7, 8-11, 33, 34, 42, 43, 44, 45 are allowed.


Art Unit: 2839

Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

N. Abrams

09/09/04


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322